

Appl. Serial. No. 10/686,228  
Reply to Office Action of 04/25/2006

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 1, 3-13, 15-22 are presented.

Claims 9-13, 17-22 are allowed.

Claim 1, 3-8, 15-16 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 USC § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph.

#### Claim Rejections 35 USC § 112:

In Claim 1, the phrase "at least a panel one . . . a panel five" is considered indefinite by suggesting that more than five (5) panels are possible on the folded material. Applicant has amended the claim to remove the "at least" limitation to resolve the question of indefiniteness. The claim language is precise in detailed the folding of the five panels called for in the claim. However, additional panels may be added to the folded material to alter the thickness or further folding arrangement. The further addition of panels is within the spirit and scope of the claimed invention so long as at least five of the panels are arranged as called for in claim 1.

Claims 3 and 15 are rejected as indefinite because they depend from a cancelled claim. Appropriate correction has been made.

Claims 1, 3-13, 15-22 have been amended to overcome the rejections under 35 USC § 112 and applicant believes the case is ready for issuance. Thus, applicant respectfully requests passing of the case to issuance in due course of Patent Office procedure.

Appl. Serial. No. 10/686,228  
Reply to Office Action of 04/25/2006

Respectfully submitted,



Seann P. Lahey  
Registration No. 51,910  
McNair Law Firm, P.A.  
P.O. Box 10827  
Greenville, SC 29603-0827  
Telephone: (864) 232-4261  
Attorney for the Applicant